



Members:

Rep. Charlie Brown, Chairman
Rep. Richard Mangus
Sen. Earline Rogers
Sen. Thomas Wyss

**AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON
LEGISLATIVE MAILINGS
LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

LSA Staff:

Philip J. Sachtleben, Staff for the Subcommittee

Authority: Legislative Council Meeting, August 4, 1998

**Legislative Services Agency
200 West Washington Street, Suite 301
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2789
Tel: (317) 232-9588 Fax: (317) 232-2554**

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: August 31, 1998
Meeting Time: 1:30 P.M.
Meeting Place: Gary Public Library, Main Branch
Meeting City: Gary, Indiana
Meeting Number: 1

Members Present: Representative Charlie Brown, Chairman; Representative Richard Mangus; Senator Earline Rogers.

Members Absent: Senator Tom Wyss.

Representative Charlie Brown, Chairman of the Subcommittee, opened the meeting at 1:30 PM. He noted for the audience that the Legislative Council had established this subcommittee to review issues raised by Representative Phyllis Pond at the August 4 meeting of the Council concerning the excessive amount of mail received by members of the General Assembly. He said that the Subcommittee would entertain suggestions for changes after hearing from representatives of Access Indiana.

Representative Brown asked Mr. Sachtleben, Executive Director of the Legislative Services Agency (LSA) to review the procedure currently used to reduce some of the mail received by legislators. Mr. Sachtleben reported that state agencies submit one or two copies of certain documents to the LSA and that the LSA annually sends out a letter to all members listing documents that have been received and that are available upon notice to the LSA. Mr. Sachtleben reported that very few legislators ask for copies of any of the documents.

Representatives Brown and Mangus expressed concern for the expensive publication

requirements of state law with respect to each school's performance on the ISTEP/A+ tests. Representative Mangus mentioned that Representative Pond had told him that her school district would need to spend approximately \$65,000 to meet this requirement.

Senator Rogers stated that individual legislators focus on different topics and issues and that a "one size fits all" approach would not work. She added that she favored a suggestion made by Representative Pond involving postcards being sent to legislators asking them whether they wanted to receive particular types of mailings from individual state agencies.

Representative Brown noted that although Representative Pond was unable to attend this meeting, she had recently reaffirmed her support for the use of postcards.

Representative Mangus asked Mr. Jay McQueen, Deputy Director of the Department of Administration (DOA), to discuss the process and costs associated with the printing of materials by the Central Printing Office of the DOA.

Mr. McQueen stated that if an agency has a printing request, it must first attempt to have the material printed by the DOA. If DOA is unable to handle the job, the second choice is PEN products. If neither of these options is acceptable, the agency may use a private printer. An RFP process is used when a private printer is involved.

The Subcommittee then discussed a particular report that was sent to the Governor's Commission on Drunk Driving. Mr. McQueen noted that this particular document may have been printed by Purdue University which was a contractor for the Commission.

In response to questions from Representatives Brown and Mangus, Mr. McQueen stated that the DOA would provide information concerning the number of items printed and the costs (when printed by Central Printing) since agencies receive an ID billing for such printing. However, he did not think he could obtain comprehensive figures for the total printing costs paid by state agencies.

The Chairman then asked Mr. Ric Brown from Access Indiana (AI) to discuss the current use of AI by state agencies. Mr. Brown noted that all but two state agencies are currently publishing materials on the Internet via AI. He noted that there are a variety of ways to get things to the Net. An agency can choose formats, etc., but there are preferred formats depending on the manner in which the materials are used.

In reply to a question from Representative Brown, Mr. Brown explained that agencies are not charged for publishing materials on AI. Rather, AI charges fees to users in those situations where AI has added value to the agency material (e.g. BMV on-line registration of vehicle renewals).

Representative Mangus returned to the question of the amount of mail received by legislators. He said that for the past month he has kept track of the amount of postage that was put on the mailings that he threw away. This amount exceeded \$100, and did not include the mailings that he kept or was otherwise interested in.

The Chairman asked the staff to search the Indiana Code for references to reports that must be made to the General Assembly, the Legislative Council, or the LSA. [NOTE: That research has been completed and is being distributed to the Legislative Council.]

Senator Rogers stated that in her opinion the General Assembly should not begin to try to micro manage state agencies by enacting legislation specifying what can be printed and how agency publications should be distributed. However, the General Assembly should have something to say about the publications that are sent to every member. Senator Rogers urged the subcommittee to develop a solution that provided individual state agencies with information as to whether individual legislators were interested in receiving a particular publication.

The subcommittee then discussed the administrative problems that could arise if the General Assembly encouraged the Executive Branch to develop a system under which state agencies would include a postcard with each of their mailings for a period of time. The postcard procedure would give individual members of the General Assembly the opportunity to review each document and then decide whether to continue receiving the document. The agencies would be expected to keep track of the wishes of individual members as to whether they wanted to continue receiving a particular type or class of publication from that agency.

Each postcard would have preset choices (e.g. "Please remove my name from the distribution list." or "Please retain my name of the distribution list.") Under Senator Rogers' proposal, the agency could remove a legislator's name if the postcard was not returned by the member of the General Assembly. New legislators would be given information concerning agency publications as part of their orientation.

The Chairman recognized Senator Cleo Washington who added his support to Senator Rogers' proposal.

The subcommittee discussed the use of electronic mail by state agencies to obtain information concerning legislators' wishes concerning the receipt of publications. The subcommittee determined that this was not feasible at this time but may become feasible if and when more legislators became regular users of e-mail.

After further discussion, Senator Rogers moved, and Representative Mangus seconded, that the Legislative Council urge the Executive Branch to establish a procedure under which state agencies would include a postcard with all publications that the agencies send to all 150 members of the General Assembly. The postcards would permit legislators to note whether or not they want to continue receiving a particular publication or type of publication.

The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:40 PM.